

**DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
COUNTY OF NEW YORK  
ONE HOGAN PLACE  
New York, N. Y. 10013  
(212) 335-9000**

OFFICER: Raymond McCann  
TAX NUMBER: 938976

**DISCLOSURE ADVISORY**

For the person named above, whom the People may call as a witness, please be advised as follows.

1. The New York City Civilian Complaint Review Board deemed substantiated an allegation of Abuse-Stop for Raymond McCann in connection with an incident that occurred on February 6, 2009. On February 6, 2009, at 11:30 PM, PO McCann was driving a marked police van and the windows of the van were rolled down. As PO McCann was driving westbound on 43<sup>rd</sup> Street and crossing over 7th Avenue, Raymond McCann heard a woman to his right say, "Nick, watch out for the police van!" Raymond McCann looked straight ahead of his vehicle and saw a man standing in the middle of the street, three or four feet from the police van, crossing the street. The man in street responded to the woman's warning by saying "Fuck the police. I don't give a shit." When twice asked directly by the CCRB, PO McCann stated that he stopped the man because he said, "Fuck the police. I don't give a shit." When asked by the CCRB if there were any additional factors that led to his stopping the man, Raymond McCann stated that there were not. The CCRB concluded that Raymond McCann stopped the man without any reason to believe he was involved in a crime and that the man's statement, particularly when directed at his own family, did not constitute a crime, nor did it create founded suspicion that a person has committed or is about to commit a crime. For this reason, the CCRB substantiated the allegation of Abuse-stop for Raymond McCann.

The matter was referred to the New York Police Department which deemed substantiated allegations that on or about February 6, 2009, Raymond McCann (1) did stop an individual without sufficient legal justification; (2) did fail to record this incident in his activity log and (3) did fail to prepare a UF-250 report regarding this incident.

2. The New York Police Department has deemed substantiated the allegation that on or about March 8, 2011, Raymond McCann violated a Department rule.
3. The New York City Civilian Complaint Review Board deemed substantiated an allegation of Abuse-Threat to damage/seize property and noted other misconduct for Failure to prepare a memo book entry for Raymond McCann for an incident that occurred on April 25, 2015. According to the complainant, on April 29, 2015, at approximately 7:00 a.m., at a house in Staten Island, the complainant was sleeping in his bedroom with his girlfriend when they were awakened by Raymond McCann of Manhattan Warrants knocking at the front door. The complainant indicated in his CCRB interview that Raymond McCann informed him he had an arrest warrant and asked him to open the door. The complainant stated that he asked whose name was on the warrant, and Raymond McCann said he would tell him after he opened the door. The complainant refused to open the door, ran to the window in the bedroom, and started recording PO McCann, who was still on the steps in front of the door. McCann stated that if the complainant did not open the door, he would take down his door.

According to the CCRB report, Raymond McCann first stated that he did not recall if he threatened to break down the door but said that he did not tell the complainant he was going to open the door, rather he told him that he could open the door because the arrest warrant gave him the authority to enter. Raymond McCann explained that if an investigation leads officers with an arrest warrant to a house, they can enter the house and search anywhere a person could hide. When he viewed the recording of the incident, Raymond McCann stated that he told the complainant he could knock the door down because “it was a statement of fact.” He added that when he spoke to complainant, he did not know who was inside of the house and believed that the individual for whom they were looking might be inside. According to the CCRB, it was clear that there were no exigent circumstances in the case and that complaint did not give Raymond McCann his consent to enter his house. The CCRB determined that Raymond McCann had no information that indicated the subject of the arrest warrant resided at that apartment in Staten Island, as the arrest warrant listed a different address altogether. Additionally, the case detective did not tell Raymond McCann the relevance of the Staten Island address or that it was an old address for the person he was seeking to arrest. As such, the CCRB determined that Raymond McCann did not have an objectively credible reason to believe that the person he was seeking to arrest was present when he threatened to enter the apartment. The CCRB concluded that since the subject of the arrest warrant did not reside at the address, and complainant, the person on the lease, denied Raymond McCann entry, Raymond McCann could not have, as he stated, entered the apartment without a search warrant. The CCRB noted that had the complainant opened the door because he believed the alternative was a broken door, the entry would have been gained via coercion rather than consent. The CCRB reported that Raymond McCann’s words lacked legal justification, and were not a statement of fact, but a threat that served no purpose but to intimidate the complainant. For these reasons the CCRB substantiated the allegation of Abuse-Threat to damage/seize property for Raymond McCann.

The CCRB also noted other misconduct for Raymond McCann because he failed to complete a memobook entry as required in connection with this incident.

Various publicly available websites and databases contain disciplinary information for certain law enforcement officers. Information in such databases about this officer is not necessarily included in this advisory.

Any information herein regarding civil lawsuits against an officer is not necessarily a complete list of civil lawsuits in which that officer is a defendant.

Allegations of misconduct that have not been substantiated and are not pending (including, but not limited to, findings of unsubstantiated, unfounded, and exonerated), and allegations of technical infractions, are not subject to disclosure and are not included in this advisory.

The decision to include information in this advisory does not represent a conclusion by the People that it is required to be disclosed.

The People reserve the right to oppose or move to limit the use of any information included herein or disclosed in the future.

If you have any questions, please contact the Assistant District Attorney assigned to the case on which you are receiving this advisory.

Date: : March 8, 2021